

Amendments to the Drawings:

In response to objection to Figure 1, a replacement sheet for Figure 1 is included with this response.

Recess 16 is defined by the base in that the bottom of the recess is defined by the base.

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-7 and 19-21 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-6, 9-11, 14 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Amaro et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,986,888). Claim 1 (alternatively) and Claim 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lo (U.S. Patent No. 6,459,583). Claims 12, 13, 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amaro et al. in view of Lin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,748).

It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention as recited in amended Claim 1 includes a feature which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Amaro et al., namely:

one or more recesses at least partially defined by adjacent parallel faces of said fins, the recesses having a depth smaller than the height of said fins, said one or more recesses being configured to support the edge of the circuit card.

This feature is found in the original filed application at page 3, lines 18-19 and can be seen in Figures 1-3. No new matter has been added. This distinguishes over Amaro et al. because the notch between 26 and 16 in Amaro et al. Figure 5 (cited in the Action on page. 3, last four lines) is defined by one fin, and also because the Amaro et al. invention intentionally lacks adjacent parallel faces of fins, as taught in Amaro et al. Col. 5, lines 1-15.

Amended Claim 1, also distinguishes applicants' invention over Lo for the following reasons: The office action on page 6 reproduces Figure 1 from Lo and equates the recesses of Claim 1 with two structures at the top of the object in Lo's figure 1. However, these two structures of Lo do not have the following feature of Claim 1:

"...fins extending perpendicularly from said base...."

Instead, the Lo structures pointed to in the Action have edges that come together at the bottom and are not perpendicular to a base. It is because applicants' invention as recited in Claim 1

has "fins extending perpendicularly from said base" that the recesses of applicants' structure are able to support a circuit card in a stable manner.

Accordingly, for reasons set forth above, amended Claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Amended Claims 15 and 18, while not identical to Claim 1, recite, respectively, "a recess" and "one or more slots", both of which are structurally similar to "one or more recesses" in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 15 and 18 are also patentable over the art of record for the same reasons set forth above concerning Claim 1.

Claim 10 has been amended and now recites a feature not disclosed in Amaro et al. namely:

affixing in a computer system a heat sink having a recess configured to receive an edge of a circuit card such that the recess orients the circuit card to enable mating the circuit card with a connector

This feature is found in the originally filed application at page 4, line 11, through page 6, line 12, and in particular at page 4, lines 26-28, and in figures 2 and 3. No new matter has been added. Amended Claim 10 is different than from Amaro et al., because Amaro et al. is silent as to mating the circuit card with the connector.

Amended Claim 21, while not identical to Claim 10, includes a feature similar to Claim 10. Accordingly, Claim 21 is also patentable over Amaro et al. for the reasons set forth above concerning Claim 10.

Claims 2-7 and 9 include all the features of Claim 1 from which they depend. Claims 11-14 contain all the features of Claim 10 from which they depend. Claims 16-20 contain all the features of Claim 15 from which they depend.

Therefore all rejected claims are patentable for the reasons set forth above.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Appln. No.: 10/651,115
Amendment Dated **August 22, 2006**
Reply to Office Action of 06/09/2006

TN285

Respectfully submitted,



Joshua L. Cohen, Reg. No. 38,040
Attorney for Applicants

Mitchell D. Hirsch, Reg. No. 54,170
Registered Patent Agent for Applicants

JLC/MDH/drm


Dated: August 22, 2006

☒ P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

☐ P.O. Box 1596
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 778-2500

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: August 22, 2006



Denise R. Marshall